

REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed October 10, 2006 and offer the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 15-20, and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,043,644 B2 to *DeBruine* (hereinafter "*DeBruine*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As a brief summary, the present invention provides HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall. A peer server registers an outbound socket connection with a proxy server. When HTTP request is sent to the peer server from an initial requestor, the HTTP request is redirected to the proxy server. The proxy server translates the HTTP request into a request packet and sends the request packet to the peer server. A peer node associated with the peer server translates the request packet back into the HTTP request and passes the HTTP request to a Web server associated with the peer server. The peer node then receives an HTTP response from the Web server and converts the HTTP response into a response packet which is then sent to the proxy server. The proxy server converts the response packet back into the HTTP response and forwards the HTTP response to the initial requester.

According to Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicants respectfully submit that *DeBruine* does not disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 1-4, 15-20, and 31-34. More specifically, claim 1 recites a method comprising, among other features, "translating the request packet back into the HTTP request" in response to a peer server receiving the request packet. Claims 17, 33, and 34 include similar features. The Applicants submit that *DeBruine* does not disclose or suggest translating a request packet back into a HTTP request. At most, *DeBruine* discloses reformatting a request into a format to which a receiving client node 156 can respond. (See *DeBruine*, col. 7, ll. 40-43). However, *DeBruine* does not disclose that after the request has been reformatted, the receiving client node 156, nor anything else for that matter, translates the request back into a HTTP request. Therefore, for this reason claims 1, 17, 33, and 34 are patentable over *DeBruine* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-4, 15, 16, 18-20, 31 and 31, which depend from claims 1 and 17, respectively, are patentable for at least this reason and the additional novel features recited therein.

Claims 5-14 and 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeBruine* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154306 A1 to *Perry* (hereinafter "*Perry*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As detailed above, *DeBruine* does not disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 1 and 17, the base claims from which claims 5-14 and 21-30 respectively depend. In addition, *Perry* does not overcome the previously noted shortcomings of *DeBruine*. Therefore, claims 5-11, 13, 14, 21-27, 29, and 30 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12 recites "creating, by the servlet thread, a peer request packet, and passing the peer request packet to the peer manager." Claim 28 includes similar features, albeit in computer-readable medium format. The Applicants submit that none of the references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature. While *DeBruine* does disclose that a housekeeping process includes a servlet process 166, *DeBruine* does not disclose or suggest that a peer request packet is created by the servlet process 166. (See *DeBruine*, col. 6, ll. 3-4). Therefore, in addition to the reasons noted above, claims 12 and 28 are patentable over the cited references.

The present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:

Benjamin S. Withrow
Registration No. 40,876
100 regency Forest Drive, Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: February 12, 2007
Attorney Docket: 1104-062